



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ought to be to all ; we are all only too likely to forget its ring when we approach an earnest argument like Dr. Haney's, which can be upheld with so much external circumstance. And I offer little comment on it : it speaks of itself for what it may be worth. However, we may observe that Coleridge was not content with expressing himself on this question in impassioned verse ; we can find his opinion in sober prose and still the same :

'And if,' says he, 'in after-time I have sought a refuge from bodily pain and mismanaged sensibility in abstruse researches, which exercised the strength and subtilty of the understanding without awakening the feelings of the heart ; still there was a long and blessed interval, during which my natural faculties were allowed to expand, and my original tendencies to develop themselves ;—my fancy, and the love of nature, and the sense of beauty in forms and sounds.'¹ Is there any use in summoning De Quincey as witness to 'what killed Coleridge as a poet' ?² Would the joint testimony of two dejected sufferers have even the force of the two Homeric rivers against the strength of external argument and armed logical procedure ? Dr. Haney and the 'others' have no feeble case.—And yet,—I believe that not even Professor Brandl himself knows more about Coleridge than Coleridge knew. I believe that *Dejection* has the breath and finer spirit of truth with which no scientific biography of the poet may safely disagree.

LANE COOPER.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY,
April, 1903.

Die englischen Ausgaben des Eulenspiegel und ihre Stellung in der Geschichte des Volksbuches. Von Friedrich Brie. Weimar, Wagner, 1903.

Eulenspiegel, the solitary piece of Low German literature in the sixteenth century which won European fame, perhaps owes to this circumstance some of its perennial attraction for German scholars. 'Howleglass' was as familiar as Faustus to Jonson and Shakspeare ;

¹ *Biographia Literaria*. Works, ed. Shedd, 3, 152, 153.

² *Coleridge and Opium-Eating*. Works, ed. Masson, 5. 207.

and *espègle* still commemorates the impression made by this robust practical joker upon the countrymen of Voltaire. Apart from literature, the history of the extant examples of the Volksbuch offers, as is well known, many problems which still await definite solution. The discovery a few years ago of a fragment of the English version opened up new questions, but it also contributed important data towards the solution of the old. Several scholars have made a beginning with the investigation; but Brie in the present dissertation offers what must be pronounced the most important contribution yet made to the questions involved, more particularly as to the origin of the English version. Since Cappenberg's discussion in his edition of *Eulenspiegel*, the English version (here denoted by F.) has been assumed to be directly derived from the Flemish (denoted by D.). Brie shows very convincingly that this cannot be the case, since F. departs from D. in a number of points which cannot be additions of the translator, being found also in the High German versions. The High German version, which contains about twice the number of stories, cannot have been directly used. No Low German version is known, but that one did exist and was the direct source of F. is shown by Brie with great ingenuity by the aid of the translator's mistakes. In a series of passages the English goes astray in a way not easily accounted for, if he was translating from Flemish, but at once explained, if he was translating from Low German. Thus, in the eleventh chapter: How Howleglass made himself a physician and how he beguiled a doctor of the bishop of Mayborough, the tormented doctor begs not, as in D. and the High German versions, for a light, but for *air*. This is not easily explained from D.: *dat hy wat lichten mochte gecrighen*, but is intelligible enough, if we suppose that the Low German used the word *luchte* (a candle, lantern) and that the translator took this for *lucht*, 'Luft,' air. Similarly, in the third chapter, the child Howleglass is said to have begun 'to daunce upon a corde and no otherwyse;' where D. gives rightly: *so leerde hi spelen ofter coorden ende (eñ) met ander gockelyen*. In Low German the *ende* would appear as *en*, which can mean both 'and' and 'not,' while *en* in Flemish means only 'not.' Flemish is likely to have been the more familiar dialect of the two to any English translator of the early sixteenth century. In the sequel Brie makes it probable that the lost Low German

version from which F. was derived was older than the High German versions ; their ampler contents presuppose a second Low German version, doubtless derived from a common original with the first, which may be placed about the beginning of the century. Brie's treatment of these matters is admirably clear. Considering, too, how many ferocious epithets have been bandied to and fro by the commentators on Shakspeare and on Dante, it may not be impertinent to attest the uniform courtesy which this commentator on the far from mealy-mouthed German rogue observes towards his predecessors.

C. H. HERFORD.

OWENS COLLEGE,
MANCHESTER, ENGLAND.

The Genitive Case in Anglo-Saxon Poetry. George Shipley.
Johns Hopkins dissertation. Baltimore, 1903. Pp. 127.

Listing, as it does, all occurrences of the Genitive in the poetry of the Grein-Wülcker *Bibliothek*, Shipley's work both in importance of subject and in scope of research at once commands our attention. Whatever its shortcomings, such a study must be a significant one : even if it failed of discovery or proof, the very attempt would by excluding barren territory serve to concentrate the efforts of other workers upon the more fruitful soil—though the reflection, perhaps, smacks more of consolation than of congratulation. However, our author has done a double and a positive service : not only has he worked his field with commendable industry and skill, but by this he has also brought more clearly into notice other rich unworked regions lying contiguous.

Prefacing this study is a useful bibliographical record of recent works relating to Old English syntax, which brings down to date Chase's *Biographical Guide* of 1896 and Wülfing's lists of 1897 and 1901. The body of the work will be analyzed and criticised chapter by chapter in the paragraphs below.

Chapter I, Genitive with Verbs, consists of two parts. First comes 'classification,' listing under ten categories all verbs governing the genitive. No examples are found here, since under the second division, 'citation,' these same verbs are all rearranged, alphabetically this time, with full exemplification from the text,